UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/038,894	03/11/1998	ROLAND STOUGHTON	UCSD-117	8909
	7590 02/16/201 ASSOCIATES, LLC	EXAMINER		
7601 LEWINS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	MELLER, MICHAEL V		
SUITE 304 MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/038,894	STOUGHTON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael V. Meller	1655
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
Period for Reply	LV IO OET TO EVEIDE AMONITI	((0) OD THEETY (00) DAYO
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MODERN OF THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MODERN OF T	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro tte, cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14. 2a) ■ This action is FINAL . 2b) ■ The 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	is/are withdrawn from considerat	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to by the edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bures* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The election of species of record is maintained for the reasons of record.

Applicant elected trauma as the disease/condition, futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-quanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate-see claims 18 and 41) as the protease inhibitor (activation lowering therapy) and free radical production as the cell activation assessment method. Thus, claims 16, 17, 33, 36, 38 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Applicant argues that claims 17, 33 and 38 should not be withdrawn from consideration but it is clear that these claims were subjected to an election of species requirement as noted above. Since applicant elected trauma as the disease/condition, futhan (nafamostate mesilate) as the activation lowering therapy (protease inhibitor) and free radical production as the cell activation assessment method, claims 17, 33 and 38 are withdrawn since they claim non-elected subject matter since the disease/condition elected was trauma which is not in claim 17 and since futhan was elected as the activation lowering therapy then claims 33 and 38 are withdrawn from consideration

Application/Control Number: 09/038,894 Page 3

Art Unit: 1655

since they do not include futhan. Further, claims 16 and 36 are withdrawn since they are drawn to non-elected protease inhibitors.

Thus, claims 16, 17, 33, 36, 38 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as being drawn to non-elected subject matter. This requirement has already been made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 32, 35, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Rabkin et al. (US 5917013) in view of Groutas (US 5550139) and further in view of JP 409040579.

Rabkin teaches that free radical production associated with oxidative stress is measured using assays such as colormetric assays, see col. 9, lines 40-50. Thus, Rabkin teaches to assess the damage of a disease(s)/condition(s) such as inflammatory disorders such as tissue trauma (as evidenced by Groutas, since Groutas teaches that inflammation is associated with tissue trauma) by assessing the free radical production as taught by Radkin (column 9, lines 40-50). Note also that Rabkin teaches that his invention could be administered to someone who has inflammatory disorders, see column 2, lines 40-60. Thus, once inflammation was detected, then treatment would be administered which would mean that the inflammation was elevated which is why it was detected.

Rabkin does not teach to use a protease inhibitor such as futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) as the treatment of the trauma once it is determined that treatment is needed for the trauma.

Groutas teaches that inflammation is associated with tissue trauma. Groutas also teaches that a serine protease such as alpha-1-proteinase inhibitor is administered to reduce inflammation, see column 1, lines 1-45. Thus, as with the teachings of Adams as

Art Unit: 1655

noted by the Board, the administration of alpha-1-proteinase will also treat the inflammation within the scope of the claims.

JP teaches that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) is well known to be used to treat inflammation, specifically inflammatory bowel disease, see abstract. It establishes that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known at the time the invention was made that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) was known to treat inflammation.

Thus, it would have been obvious to use a protease inhibitor such as the elected futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) of Groutas and JP as the treatment in Rabkin when inflammation was detected since Groutas makes it clear that inflammation is associated with tissue trauma and thus it would be clearly obvious to treat trauma (as elected) with a compound which is known to treat inflammation effectively, in fact JP teaches that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) is known to treat IBS (irratible bowel syndrome) effectively.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 32, 35, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over WO 92/15707 in view of Groutas (US 5550139) and further in view of JP 409040579.

WO teaches that free radical production is assayed by using immunoassay methods, see abstract, page 20, line 15-page 21, line 10. WO uses its compositions to treat (therapy) of inflammatory diseases, see abstract.

WO states that not only may this permit appropriate actions to avoid the pathogenic potential of these antibodies, but the detection serves in itself as a sensitive measure of ongoing oxidative damage. As noted in the abstract, the immunoassay methods are used to diagnose inflammatory diseases as well as monitoring of the progress or therapy of such diseases or conditions. Thus, once inflammation was detected, then treatment would be administered which would mean that the inflammation was elevated which is why it was detected.

WO does not teach to use a protease inhibitor such as futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) as the treatment of the trauma once it is determined that treatment is needed for the trauma.

Groutas teaches that inflammation is associated with tissue trauma. Groutas also teaches that a serine protease such as alpha-1-proteinase inhibitor is administered to reduce inflammation, see column 1, lines 1-45. Thus, as with the teachings of Adams as

Art Unit: 1655

noted by the Board, the administration of alpha-1-proteinase will also treat the inflammation within the scope of the claims.

JP teaches that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) is well known to be used to treat inflammation, specifically inflammatory bowel disease, see abstract. It establishes that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known at the time the invention was made that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) was known to treat inflammation.

Thus, it would have been obvious to use a protease inhibitor such as the elected futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) of Groutas and JP as the treatment in WO when inflammation was detected since Groutas makes it clear that inflammation is associated with tissue trauma and thus it would be clearly obvious to treat trauma (as elected) with a compound which is known to treat inflammation effectively, in fact JP teaches that futhan (nafamostate mesilate aka 6- amidino-2-naphthyl p-guanidinobenzoate dimethanesulfonate) is known to treat IBS (irratible bowel syndrome) effectively.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 571-272-0967. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael V. Meller/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655

Application/Control Number: 09/038,894

Page 9

Art Unit: 1655